



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/565,195	01/20/2006	Soo-han Park	102-1647T	9289		
38209	7590	03/30/2011	EXAMINER			
STANZIONE & KIM, LLP 919 18TH STREET, N.W. SUITE 440 WASHINGTON, DC 20006				PENDLETON, DIONNE		
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER				
2627						
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE				
03/30/2011		PAPER				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/565,195	PARK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DIONNE H. PENDLETON	2627	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 April 2010.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-18 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 18 and 20 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. Claims 18 and 20 could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action after the filing of a request for continued examination and the submission under 37 CFR 1.114. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Izumi (US 6,778,475)**.

Regarding claim 18,

In Figure 14, Izumi teaches a photo detector comprising:

a first detector (the combination of "410", "411" and "412" in figure 14) detecting light components reflected from an optical recording medium and a beam splitter ("3" in fig. 2A, 2B) and converting the reflected light components into a first set of electrical signals;

and a second detector ("210" in figure 14) detecting the light components reflected from the optical recording medium and the beam splitter (3) and converting the reflected light components into a second set of electrical signals;

wherein the center of the first detector (410-412) is separated from a center of the second detector (210); and

wherein the first detector (410-412) is divided into no more than eight detecting regions and the second detector (210) is divided into four detecting regions.

Figure 14 illustrates that the detectors are separated by a predetermined distance (column 17, line 60). Though Izumi fails to expressly teach that the predetermined distance is in consideration of the beam splitter's thickness, it would have been obvious to calculate said predetermined distance in consideration of the thickness of the beam

splitter, as well as in consideration of other characteristics of the optical system, since said beam splitter is on the transmission path between the optical storage medium and the detection plane, and any beam influencing characteristics of the beam splitter must be taken into consideration for the purpose of positioning the detecting elements so as to receive the light spots transmitted from the beam splitter.

Regarding claim 20,

Izumi teaches the photo detector according to claim 18, wherein the first detector (410-412 in figure 14) includes a first central sensor (410) and first (411) and second (412) peripheral sensors

and the second detector (“210” in figure 14) includes a second central sensor.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 1-17 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 18 and 20 are rejected in the Official Action mailed 1/26/2010 have been considered but are not persuasive.

Regarding Applicant's Argument That Izumi does not teach or disclose that the “first detector is divided into no more than eight detecting regions and the second detector (210) is divided into four detecting regions” as presently claimed:

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant. Figure 14 of Izumi illustrates a first detector (410-412) which is divided into no more than eight detecting regions, and a second detector (210) which is divided into four detecting regions, as presently claimed. Furthermore, Claims 18 and 20 would have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Kim (US 6,552,974) discloses a detector arrangement.

Yamakawa (US RE 38,538) discloses a detector arrangement.

Seong (US 2004/024683) discloses a detector arrangement.

Ogasawara (US 7,116,612) discloses a detector arrangement.

Masui (US 7,911,922) discloses a detector arrangement.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DIONNE H. PENDLETON whose telephone number is (571)272-7497. The examiner can normally be reached on 10:30-7:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wayne Young can be reached on 571-272-7582. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Dionne H Pendleton/
Examiner, Art Unit 2627

/Wayne Young/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2627